

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : MR. TOLSON

DATE: 1/28/64

FROM : A. H. Belmont

cc Mr. Belmont
Mr. Rosen
Mr. Malley
Mr. Sullivan
Mr. DeLoach

SUBJECT: LEE HARVEY OSWALD
Internal Security - Russia

I called SAC Shanklin, Dallas, and advised him that we have been informed that District Attorney Wade, in his recent appearance before representatives of the President's Commission to investigate the assassination of President Kennedy, had made the statement that Dallas reporter Hudkins claims Oswald was known as Informant #179 in the FBI, and was paid \$200 a month. The Commission asked Wade what he knew about informants in the FBI and he said that when he was in South America as a Bureau representative he was given money and never had to get receipts; that the Bureau depended on his integrity to spend the money properly and there was no accounting for the money. The inference, of course, is that under these circumstances the Bureau would not know at headquarters whether Oswald had been an informant and had been paid, as there was no accounting for the money. The Commission asked Wade whether he left the Bureau under a shadow, and he replied that he did not; that he was asked to stay, but that he wanted to practice law.

Mr. Shanklin was advised that the Commission was desirous of knowing how they could run this down and present a convincing picture to the effect that Oswald was not a Bureau informant, and it was suggested to them that they call Hudkins and put him under oath, regardless of the fact that he might go back and write a story that the FBI was being investigated by the Commission. Shanklin was advised that, in addition, we are preparing appropriate information here at the seat of government relative to the handling of informants and the accountability of funds.

Shanklin was informed that we want him to be very circumspect in his dealings with Wade, inasmuch as, by inference at least, Wade indicated that the Bureau was not in a position to state whether Oswald was or was not an informant. I told Shanklin this, of course, is not true, as we account for all funds paid to informants or for information of any kind, and we have a strict accountability for the designation and handling of informants.

ANB:CSH (6)

79 FEB 17 1964

EX-102
REC-53
PERS. REC. UNIT

24 FEB 1964

XEROX

12 1964